

Application S/N 10/667,269
Amendment Dated: July 12, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: February 7, 2006

CE11663JDP

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,326,906 to Thus (Thus). Additionally, claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thus in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,906 to Schnizlein, et al. (Schnizlein).

Independent claim 1 recites the element that for each combination of the array row input/outputs, non-set rows can be selectively coupled to the array row input/outputs that comprise the combination. Independent claim 8 recites a similar feature. As shown in FIGs. 3 and 4 and described on page 11, lines 1-8 of the specification, a non-set row can be any row (310, 410) that is not part of a set of rows (324, 424), which can increase the number of keys (122) in an array.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that this concept is shown in Thus. In particular, in FIG. 2 of Thus, the rows of the keyboard (1) are coupled together with diodes (3, 4, 5) and are not considered non-set rows, as in the present invention. The use of non-set rows (326, 426) of the present invention increases the number of keys (122) in an array without increasing the number of input/outputs. Moreover, these non-set rows (326, 426) permit greater flexibility in the type of arrays. For example, the use of a non-set row (326, 426) can permit the array to include any suitable number of rows of keys (122), including odd numbers of rows. As shown in FIG. 2, the configuration of Thus limits the number of rows to an even number (e.g., six).

Application S/N 10/667,269
 Amendment Dated: July 12, 2006
 Response to Office Action dated: February 7, 2006

CE11663JDP

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
 Law Department – MD 1610
 8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
 Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: 
 Larry G. Brown
 Attorney of Record
 Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295
 Fax No.: (954) 723-3871